IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT BOMBAY
CIVIL APPELLATE JURISDICTION

WRIT PETITION NO. 8587 OF 2006

Dr.Rajeev Sharma ....
Petitioner
V/s
Shankar NaryanCollege & Ors... .....
Respondents.

Office Notes, Office Memoranda of Coram, appearances Court's orders or directions and Registrar's orders.) Court's or Judge's Orders

---

Mr.R.S.Upadhyay, Adv. for the petitioner.

Mr.A.A.Kumbhakoni, Sr. Counsel with Mr.A.M. Kulkarni for respondents 1 and 2.

CORAM: A.P. DESHPANDE, J.
9.4.2007

PC:

The petitioner was appointed as lecturer in the subject of Hindi in a senior college temporarily on ad-hoc basis. The petitioner has worked for three academic sessions under three appointment orders each one terming the appointment as temporary and ad-hoc till the end of academic session. The petitioner was appointed on his selection by the local management committee and the petitioner was not selected by the duly

constituted selection committee. After the discontinuance of the petitioner the duly constituted selection committee had carried on process of selection wherein one Smt.Manisha Gharat came to be selected and appointed with effect from 30.6.05. Aggrieved by termination of service the petitioner filed an appeal before the College Tribunal. Before the College Tribunal the petitioner made two fold submission, (i)that having worked for three academic sessions, the petitioner should not have been terminated and (ii) that the selection committee which selected the candidate in the year 2005 was not properly constituted. In relation to the first submission the Tribunal has held that as the petitioner was not selected by duly constituted selection committee he did not have right to the post in question and in regard to second submission it is obvious that the petitioner had not participated in the selection process wherein the candidate was selected and hence he cannot question the legality and validity of the constitution of selection committee. Perused the judgment and order passed by the Tribunal. Same does not suffer from any illegality, much less patent, warranting interference in exercise of writ

jurisdiction. Hence writ petition is summarily dismissed.

9.4.07.